

Pages 1 - 20

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable William Alsup, Judge

|              |   |                           |
|--------------|---|---------------------------|
| GOOGLE LLC , | ) |                           |
|              | ) |                           |
| Plaintiff,   | ) |                           |
|              | ) |                           |
| VS.          | ) | <b>NO. C 20-06754-WHA</b> |
|              | ) |                           |
| SONOS, INC., | ) |                           |
|              | ) |                           |
| Defendant.   | ) |                           |
| _____        | ) |                           |

San Francisco, California  
Thursday, October 7, 2021

**TRANSCRIPT OF REMOTE TELECONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS**

**APPEARANCES:** (Appearances via AT&T Teleconference.)

For Plaintiff:

QUINN, EMANUEL, URQUHART  
& SULLIVAN LLP  
50 California Street - 22nd Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111  
**BY: CHARLES K. VERHOEVEN, ATTORNEY AT LAW**

For Defendant:

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
The Orrick Building  
405 Howard Street  
San Francisco, California 94105  
**BY: CLEMENT S. ROBERTS, ATTORNEY AT LAW**

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
777 South Figueroa Street - Suite 3200  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
**BY: ALYSSA M. CARIDIS, ATTORNEY AT LAW**

Reported By: Ruth Levine Ekhaus, RMR, RDR, FCRR  
Official Reporter, CSR No. 12219

Thursday - October 7, 2021

2:21 p.m.

P R O C E E D I N G S

---o0o---

**THE CLERK:** Please come to order.

We're now calling Civil Case --

**THE COURT:** The Google case.

**THE CLERK:** I'm sorry?

**THE COURT:** Call the Google case first.

**THE CLERK:** Oh. Okay.

We're now calling Civil Case 20-06754-WHA, Google LLC  
versus Sonos Inc.

Counsel, starting with the plaintiff, please state your  
appearance for the record.

**MR. ROBERTS:** Well, Your Honor, this Mr. Roberts, Clem  
Roberts, from Orrick Herrington, and with me is Ms. Caridis, on  
behalf of Sonos. Whether we are the plaintiff or defendant,  
I'm not sure whether the clerk called the DJ case or the  
transferred case, but we're certainly operatively plaintiffs.

**THE COURT:** Okay.

**MR. VERHOEVEN:** Good afternoon, Your Honor. Charles  
Verhoeven on behalf of Google. And with me are some of my  
colleagues, and we also have in-house counsel on the phone.

**THE COURT:** All right. Welcome.

Anyone else?

(No response.)

1           **THE COURT:** All right. Just let me make sure I --  
2 let's see.

3           The Sonos case, has our district court received that from  
4 Texas yet?

5           **MR. VERHOEVEN:** Your Honor, this is Mr. Verhoeven.  
6 I believe it has, and the case has been assigned to a  
7 magistrate. Let's see --

8           **THE COURT:** Well, I was going to relate it to me,  
9 unless I --

10          **MR. VERHOEVEN:** Right, but -- I'm sorry.

11          **THE COURT:** Does everyone one agree it should be  
12 related to me?

13          **MR. VERHOEVEN:** Yes, we all do, Your Honor.

14          **MR. ROBERTS:** Your Honor, we agree it's related to the  
15 existing case. There is also -- for your consideration, there  
16 is another case that's pending between Google and Sonos in the  
17 same courtroom. I understand your preference is to relate  
18 these two cases and that's fine. I just wanted to give you  
19 complete information.

20          **THE COURT:** Well, I'm unaware of two other cases. I  
21 thought there was just one in Texas, and then it's now showed  
22 up here. But you're saying there is yet a third one?

23          **MR. ROBERTS:** Yes, Your Honor. There is a case where  
24 Google has sued Sonos that -- on several patents that is also  
25 pending in the Northern District of California. And that is an

1 earlier filed case. So it's the same parties. It's different  
2 patents. It's different accused products. It's going in the  
3 other direction. But it is an active litigation between the  
4 two parties.

5 **THE COURT:** Well, is that the one that was in front of  
6 Judge Chen, I think?

7 **MR. VERHOEVEN:** Yes, Your Honor.

8 **THE COURT:** All right. So I'm not going to relate  
9 that one. That one is different patents. So that one, I think  
10 it's the same parties, but they -- it's a completely different  
11 problem. So I'm not going to relate that one. But I will  
12 relate the one that is the mirror-image of the case I have that  
13 is coming from Texas. That's what I meant to do.

14 I hope my law clerk understands that difference. I'm only  
15 going to relate one of the two, namely the one from Texas.

16 All right. So here is my plan for your case: We're going  
17 to do my showdown, patent showdown and by, probably, May of  
18 next year, we'll be in trial. I will get out an order that  
19 explains how that works.

20 But the trial will only be on two claims; each of you get  
21 a chance to pick a claim. It won't be on the entire mess. But  
22 I need for you to give me an outside date for the rest of the  
23 mess such -- you know, like, November of next year or even  
24 February of the following year. I can live with that.

25 But on the showdown, I'm going to speed things along and

1 make you work hard, wreck your holidays. You'll wish that you  
2 had stayed in Texas.

3 So I'll let you try to talk me out of that. The plaintiff  
4 gets to go first. Mr. Roberts.

5 **MR. ROBERTS:** Yes. Thank you so much, Your Honor.

6 Your Honor, our preference, if the Court is willing to  
7 consider it, would be to have the whole mess go to trial in  
8 June. The parties were working --

9 **THE COURT:** No, that's not possible. It's impossible.  
10 There are too many claims. How many claims are in suit here?

11 **MR. ROBERTS:** Too many claims are in suit, Your Honor.  
12 At the moment, there are 69 claims asserted -- but we know that  
13 those need to be narrowed -- and 353 pieces of prior art.

14 **THE COURT:** That is ridiculous. That is ridiculous.

15 Do you know how hard we're working here at the district  
16 court? I can't imagine that you would try to file a case with  
17 69 claims. It's even more reason to do the patent showdown  
18 faster and get to the heart of it, rather than to let you drag  
19 this out with -- even if it was 29 claims, that's too many.  
20 It's got to be a single-digit case. Maybe nine would not be  
21 too many, but that's ridiculous.

22 Okay. You haven't talked me out of it.

23 Mr. Verhoeven, would you like to try to talk me out of it?

24 **MR. VERHOEVEN:** The only -- I'm not going to try to  
25 talk you out of it, Your Honor.

1 I will mention, just for context, that this is a large  
2 dispute between Google and Sonos, which Sonos instigated, and  
3 there is litigations in other countries as well. And it's a  
4 very large dispute, and so because of that, there is a  
5 possibility -- and I'm not advocating for not doing this  
6 procedure, Your Honor, but there is a possibility that it would  
7 be less effective than it would be in a normal case where the  
8 entire case is subsumed within one courtroom.

9 **THE COURT:** Well, you know, you raise a good point.  
10 And I am a victim of my own experience, and when you have these  
11 gigantic, messy cases that sprawl the universe, if some judge  
12 doesn't take the bull by the horns and say "Get in here, we're  
13 going to get a jury" -- see, I've learned that these patent  
14 lawyers don't like juries, and so you will not -- you will be  
15 afraid.

16 I'm just -- I'm exaggerating here because I know --  
17 Mr. Verhoeven, at least you've tried a case -- that I'm telling  
18 you something, getting it in front of a jury -- I'm pounding  
19 the desk -- is the way to get this whole thing settled. The  
20 whole thing will settle, in my view.

21 So it's going to be May or June, and I'll give you a date  
22 in, like, February of '23 to try the rest of the case. And --

23 **MR. ROBERTS:** Your Honor, could I ask a --

24 **THE COURT:** -- that's the way we're going to go.

25 Okay. Go ahead. Let me hear what you have to say.

1           **MR. ROBERTS:** Yes, Your Honor. This is Mr. Roberts.

2           If I could ask for you to consider two possible, small  
3 modifications to your usual procedure. I mean the patent  
4 showdown procedure.

5           The first is, if it's possible, we'd like to try two  
6 claims. If you look at the four patents that we have here in  
7 suit, Your Honor, they're basically two types of inventions.  
8 There are two patents on one invention. There are two patents  
9 on another invention.

10          And if what we're talking about is trying to, you know,  
11 grab the bull by the horns and get the parties some  
12 information, it would be very helpful if we could put one claim  
13 from each of those two categories of patents in front of Your  
14 Honor and have that. And if Mr. Verhoeven wanted do two  
15 claims, so we were going to trial on four claims, we would have  
16 no objection to that.

17          And the second part is, Your Honor, is that I know very  
18 often in your patent showdowns, you don't allow damages in.  
19 But, again, as there are many disputes between both parties  
20 relating to lots of patents, part of what we're talking about  
21 here is the valuation of portfolios. And so giving the parties  
22 information about how those patents are valued ought to be  
23 helpful insofar as we're signaling and extrapolating.

24          And so, if you would consider either or both of those two  
25 modifications, we would appreciate it.

1           **THE COURT:** Well, wait a minute. I understand the  
2 point about the two versus one, but I don't understand -- what  
3 do you mean I don't allow damages in?

4           **MR. ROBERTS:** My understanding was that damages would  
5 be bifurcated. But if we're going to have damages in the  
6 patent showdown procedure so we can put on a damages case, then  
7 that's fine.

8           **THE COURT:** Well, okay. I see what you mean. I'll  
9 think about it. I don't --

10           **MR. VERHOEVEN:** Your Honor, this is Mr. Verhoeven.  
11 If I could quickly respond?

12           **THE COURT:** Yes, please.

13           **MR. VERHOEVEN:** I think it's a little premature to  
14 make decisions like this at this point. For example, we're  
15 going to be amending our complaint. I don't believe that --  
16 believe it or not, I don't believe the case is at issue yet.  
17 But, in any event, we intend to amend the complaint. And we'll  
18 work with Mr. Roberts and his side to see if we can't just do  
19 it by stipulation. But that's one thing.

20           And in terms of the number of claims and damages and not  
21 damages, I just think it would be better for -- if there was a  
22 dispute, that we should meet and confer with each other. And  
23 if there is a dispute or a joint suggestion, we could make that  
24 at a later point in time. We've got a lot of time until May.

25           **THE COURT:** All right. I'll consider what you've just



1 said.

2 What is the product?

3 **MR. ROBERTS:** So, Your Honor, the accused products  
4 that we're talking about here really are smartphones and  
5 speakers. So we're talking about, you know, speakers that go  
6 inside your house and that can be used to play back music. And  
7 when we're talking about the controllers, which are implemented  
8 in software on a smartphone -- and so we're talking really  
9 about, you know, software on smartphones and, you know, home  
10 stereo -- wireless smartphone stereo systems.

11 **MR. VERHOEVEN:** Your Honor, Mr. Verhoeven here.

12 I would tend to agree with that description. These are  
13 speaker patents that concern a system that has speakers.

14 In our view, I wanted to raise this issue with Your Honor  
15 today too on the patents. We believe that these patents are so  
16 trivial and so -- lack so much detail that it would be worth  
17 the Court's effort if we did an early Section 101 motion on the  
18 patents.

19 And to the extent we're talking about a schedule, I would  
20 request to the Court that we -- I think, it would be efficient  
21 to do that right at the outset, Your Honor, rather than spend a  
22 bunch of money on discovery and whatnot, just to learn that the  
23 patents are going to be invalidated under 101.

24 So I would suggest that we have an early 12(c) motion, if  
25 you want to call it that, where Your Honor can determine

1 whether or not the patents are enforceable under Section 101.

2 **THE COURT:** Do you have any -- is there a PTAB  
3 proceeding?

4 **MR. VERHOEVEN:** There is one IPR that's been filed on  
5 one of the patents, and that's it so far. And we -- I can  
6 speak for Google, we don't intend to move for a stay based on  
7 that.

8 **THE COURT:** How many -- how many patents are there all  
9 together?

10 **MR. VERHOEVEN:** It's four patents, Your Honor. And I  
11 can go through in detail and explain why I think they are  
12 susceptible to 101 if you would like, but --

13 **THE COURT:** No, not yet. But what's the one that's in  
14 the IPR?

15 **MR. VERHOEVEN:** The '615. Let's see. Which one --

16 **MR. ROBERTS:** Your Honor, they just filed the IPR a  
17 couple of days ago after the transfer decision came down. I  
18 don't think they filed it before then because of Fintiv, and  
19 they -- then they thought they got more time after the case was  
20 transferred, so then they went ahead and filed the IPR.

21 **THE COURT:** "They" being who?

22 **MR. ROBERTS:** "They" being Google, Your Honor.  
23 This is Mr. Roberts from --

24 **THE COURT:** Google has sought an IPR on the '615?

25 **MR. ROBERTS:** Correct, Your Honor.

1           **MR. VERHOEVEN:** To answer your question, Your Honor,  
2 the '615 is -- we've grouped the patents into two categories  
3 for ease of reference. I think we have. I'll be corrected if  
4 I'm wrong but two of the patents are referred to as the "zone  
5 scene" patents. Those are the '966 -- '966 and '885.

6           And then -- bear with me here. And then those two patents  
7 are referred to as -- we call them the Q, as in Charles -- I'm  
8 sorry, C as in Charles, Q patents. And those are the '033  
9 patent and the '615 patent.

10           **THE COURT:** Are you going to file IPR on any more?

11           **MR. VERHOEVEN:** We're considering it, but they have no  
12 current plans to move forward with more IPRs.

13           **THE COURT:** If you could only bring a Section 101  
14 motion on one individual patent, which one would it be?

15           **MR. VERHOEVEN:** I would have to go re-look at them,  
16 Your Honor, because, frankly, they are very trivial and they  
17 are all great candidates. I could pick one if Your Honor would  
18 prefer to do it that way.

19           **THE COURT:** Explain to me why they are so ridiculous.

20           **MR. VERHOEVEN:** Well, for example, the QC patent,  
21 essentially, what they're -- what they concern, Your Honor, is  
22 transferring playback of media from one hardware device to  
23 another. That's the invention. And, you know, two patents  
24 that basically concern some details about a method for  
25 transferring streaming media from one playback device to

1 another playback device; something that's been done manually  
2 for years and years. At your house, you turn on the radio, and  
3 if you want to listen in a different room, you turn on the  
4 other radio in the different room. You're still manually --  
5 you're doing it manually, but you're able to do this basic  
6 practice. So that's the QC patents.

7 The other two patents, Your Honor, the zone scene patents  
8 are continuations, and there's patents that Sonos already has  
9 on the arrangement and placement of speakers in zones. And  
10 these patents add the words "zone scene" and that's it. The  
11 word "scene." And that's been construed already by the Court  
12 to mean that the zones have a common theme.

13 So these patents are essentially grouping zones according  
14 to a common theme. You know, again, it's very simple ways of  
15 manipulating existing technology that anyone could do who's put  
16 their head to it. And they are not -- there is no technical  
17 innovation there. They're -- we think they are all subject to  
18 101.

19 **MR. ROBERTS:** Your Honor, this is Mr. Roberts. .

20 May I respond briefly?

21 **THE COURT:** Sure. Of course. Go ahead.

22 **MR. ROBERTS:** So a couple of things, Your Honor.

23 First, Mr. Verhoeven -- the rhetorics around, like, these  
24 are simple patents, I would just ask the Court to leave that  
25 aside. Mr. Verhoeven was saying the exact same things about

1 the five Sonos patents in the ITC. They were trivial; they  
2 were obvious in light of the prior art; we had so much prior  
3 art; these are completely trivial; it was Rule 11, yet all five  
4 of them were found valid and infringed.

5 So I would ask the Court to withhold judgment,  
6 notwithstanding Mr. Verhoeven's rhetoric about these how these  
7 are trivial or simple. Obviously, we disagree.

8 The second point I would make is: If these were ripe  
9 candidates for 101, this case has been around for quite a  
10 while, Mr. Verhoeven hasn't filed any 101 challenges. He could  
11 have filed the 12(c) motion before now. He could have filed a  
12 12(b)(6) motion before now. No such motion has been filed.

13 We have final invalidity contentions. We have final  
14 infringement contentions. This case has been moving along,  
15 quite along. We have coming to Your Honor early next week a  
16 request to go to the Hague for third-party discovery as soon as  
17 we get back the discovery responses from Spotify, which has  
18 refused to provide discovery here. We're actively in  
19 discovery.

20 So the notion that somehow we ought to slow the trains up  
21 and do 101 because this is totally trivial and ought to be  
22 disposed of at the outset, you know, there has been quite a lot  
23 of motions and quite a lot of paper spilt on these patents  
24 already and the notion that this is really a trivial  
25 outset-type issue just doesn't ring true in light of that

1 history.

2 I would be happy to respond to the specifics about the  
3 patents if it would be interesting to Your Honor. But there  
4 is -- you know, the way in which you transfer media that is  
5 playing back to your phone, in synchronicity, without skipping  
6 a beat, using the cloud, to a set of devices within the home  
7 and how you do that, that is a technology that they have  
8 adopted from us. And nobody was doing it before Sonos. And,  
9 you know, they -- we just fundamentally disagree with their  
10 characterization of the patents.

11 **THE COURT:** All right. I'll get out an order -- yes?

12 **MR. VERHOEVEN:** I was just going to have a quick  
13 response, Your Honor.

14 **THE COURT:** All right. Go ahead.

15 **MR. VERHOEVEN:** Just so you know, the reason that we  
16 haven't filed it yet is because in the local rules in the  
17 Western District of Texas, the first -- I don't know -- six to  
18 eight months of the case are devoted to -- if it's a transfer  
19 motion, are devoted to discovery solely and exclusively on the  
20 issue of transfer. And so we have had no discovery. We have  
21 had no opportunity to do anything except have the transfer  
22 motion decided. Although the Court did rule on Markman -- what  
23 was it -- four days after he denied transfer.

24 But we haven't -- the reason we haven't been filing a 101  
25 is because we were focusing on get the case transferred,

1 Your Honor.

2 Secondly, I'm not really interested in playing games about  
3 what happened in another case. But I will point out that  
4 counsel neglected to mention that, in the initial determination  
5 at the ITC, the ALJ recommended and found that there is no  
6 infringement of any of the five asserted patents under Google's  
7 design-around, which has been adjudicated and ruled upon.

8 I'm done, Your Honor.

9 **THE COURT:** All right. With respect to ADR, what is  
10 your druther? Do you want a private mediator? Do you want a  
11 magistrate judge? What do you want?

12 **MR. ROBERTS:** Your Honor, I hesitate to take up court  
13 resources for this. The parties have mediated this dispute  
14 several times. I think it's certainly appropriate to order us  
15 to do so at some point. But, as Mr. Verhoeven said, this is a  
16 large, complex dispute. And I just -- I hesitate to impose on  
17 the court's resources any more than we are.

18 **THE COURT:** Are you saying private mediation?

19 **MR. ROBERTS:** Yes, Your Honor.

20 **THE COURT:** All right. I'm going to give you until  
21 December 3rd to pick the mediator and be on the calendar of the  
22 mediator. And then I'll give you until May 27 to actually do  
23 the mediation.

24 All right. The way this is going to work is I'm going to  
25 give you a standard a case management order, but then I'm going

1 to also give you a showdown order and they will operate side by  
2 side. And you must do all of your infringement contentions on  
3 everything and your invalidity contentions on every single  
4 claim that's at issue. Even if we're doing the showdown, you  
5 still got to -- the big case moves along in parallel with the  
6 showdown. So that's the way I like to do it.

7 **MR. ROBERTS:** Your Honor, could I just ask a question  
8 about that?

9 We did final infringement and invalidity contentions in  
10 Texas. And those are in two parts. There is a cover pleading,  
11 which differs from this Court's form a little bit. And then  
12 there are charts, which are essentially identical to this  
13 Court's requirement.

14 And so we, on behalf of Sonos, would propose that the  
15 charts which everybody submitted as final infringement and  
16 invalidity contentions, be fixed and that those are done, and  
17 that we redo the cover pleadings, because we want to put them  
18 in the form that this Court prefers. But we do not necessarily  
19 think we ought to be going back and doing another full bite at  
20 the apple on infringement and invalidity when we've got those  
21 contentions done, in final form, and everybody understood that  
22 they were set in Texas.

23 **THE COURT:** All right. What's the response to that?

24 **MR. VERHOEVEN:** This is Mr. Verhoeven.

25 I don't have an issue with that, Your Honor.



1 I would also mention, along the same lines, in terms of  
2 cleaning up things, there are two outstanding motions that have  
3 been filed and have not been ruled upon in the Western  
4 District. And my suggestion would be that we just refile them  
5 pursuant to the local rules here. But if Your Honor wants, we  
6 could just indicate what they are and, Your Honor, could pull  
7 them out.

8 **THE COURT:** What are those motions?

9 **MR. VERHOEVEN:** Oh. Okay. One is, a motion to  
10 dismiss Sonos's willfulness allegations.

11 And it might be helpful to wait until we see what  
12 they're -- I assume we're going to get some counterclaims from  
13 them for patent infringement. So it may make sense for us  
14 to -- well, I guess we should talk about that. I mean,  
15 currently --

16 **MR. ROBERTS:** Mr. Verhoeven -- sorry.

17 **MR. VERHOEVEN:** Currently there is -- I'm sorry. I  
18 didn't want to interrupt. Is someone talking?

19 **MR. ROBERTS:** Yeah. I was just saying, I'm happy -- I  
20 don't have a problem with your either refiling the motions or  
21 you renewing them. Perhaps we could just talk about this  
22 offline in terms of working on amending the pleadings, and  
23 those kind of things. I'm sure we could work this out.

24 **MR. VERHOEVEN:** Great. I just didn't -- in case His  
25 Honor had a preference, I just -- those were the two options I

1 was looking at, Your Honor.

2 **THE COURT:** I want you to refile those motions, but  
3 the one on the willfulness, okay. What is the other one on?

4 **MR. VERHOEVEN:** The other one is a motion to strike  
5 Sonos's conception dates. There is a -- there is a -- Google  
6 filed a motion to strike Sonos's conception date because Sonos  
7 failed to timely disclose conception and reduction to practice  
8 evidence in compliance with Judge Allbright's rules.

9 You know, this motion is based on the local rules of the  
10 Western District of Texas, but they are basically the same as  
11 the Northern District rules in substance, Your Honor.

12 **THE COURT:** Wait. Wait. I am not going to -- no.  
13 That will have to be refiled and be based on whatever rules we  
14 got here. I'm not going to -- please don't -- I'm not going to  
15 start enforcing Western District rules. So that one I'm not  
16 going to allow. That one is denied. But the other one, I'll  
17 let you refile it under -- and I'll go ahead and hear that one.

18 **MR. VERHOEVEN:** Thank you, Your Honor.

19 On the -- on the one about conception date, I don't want  
20 Google to be prejudiced because of the transfer. And although  
21 the local rules aren't identical, Your Honor, there is  
22 deadlines in California as well that have the same consequences  
23 if they're missed.

24 **THE COURT:** But the case just got here.

25 **MR. VERHOEVEN:** I'm sorry?

1           **THE COURT:** Didn't the case just arrive here? And I  
2 had stayed the case, the other case; right? So I don't see how  
3 it could be late here.

4           **MR. VERHOEVEN:** All right. Well, this ties into the  
5 contentions and whatnot. So I'll confer -- hopefully, we can  
6 just resolve it and I'll confer with Sonos's counsel.

7           **THE COURT:** This must be a pretty sold old patent,  
8 because if we're having to rely on a date of conception -- how  
9 old are these patents?

10          **MR. ROBERTS:** I apologize, Your Honor. I don't have  
11 the priority dates in front of me.

12          **THE COURT:** Okay.

13          **MR. ROBERTS:** Some of them go back a way.

14          **THE COURT:** Do they go back more than 10 years?

15          **MR. VERHOEVEN:** Here, I have them, Your Honor. Hold  
16 on a sec.

17          **MR. ROBERTS:** Ms. Caridis, do you have that handy?

18          **MS. CARIDIS:** Yes, Your Honor. This is Alyssa Caridis  
19 on behalf of Sonos.

20          The zone scenes patents date back to 2005 and the Cloud Q  
21 patents date back to 2011.

22          **THE COURT:** All right. Well, 2005, I guess, the date  
23 of conception doesn't matter. Maybe.

24          **MR. ROBERTS:** I will point out, Your Honor, that they  
25 have, I think, if I'm get the number here correct, they have

1 353 prior art references that they have cited against the  
2 patents.

3 **THE COURT:** Well, you've got 69 claims. That's not so  
4 bad with 69 claims.

5 **MR. ROBERTS:** Yes, your Honor. I'm not arguing about  
6 excessiveness. I'm just saying that I believe they've already  
7 boiled the ocean.

8 **THE COURT:** Well, excellent.

9 **MR. VERHOEVEN:** And anyway, Your Honor, I'll meet and  
10 confer on that other motion and see if we can't throw that in  
11 the mix of things we're negotiating with to see if we can't  
12 just resolve it and not have to raise -- have it raise its head  
13 again.

14 **THE COURT:** Thank you.

15 All right. I've got to run because I've got another case  
16 to deal with here. And I'll get some orders out.

17 And welcome to the Court. Good luck to both sides.

18 **MR. VERHOEVEN:** Thank you, Your Honor.

19 **MR. ROBERTS:** Thank you.

20 **THE COURT:** You all can hang up now.

21 (Proceedings adjourned at 2:59 p.m.)

22 ---o0o---

23

24

25

**CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER**

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript  
from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

DATE: Tuesday, October 12, 2021

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Ruth Levine Ekhaus", followed by a horizontal line.

---

Ruth Levine Ekhaus, RMR, RDR, FCRR, CSR No. 12219  
Official Reporter, U.S. District Court